

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1, 4-21, 29, and 31-41 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-17, and 37-41 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10-098588 (Hidetoshi) in view of JP 07-254972 (Takashi). These rejections are traversed.

Each of the independent claims recites one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Hidetoshi in view of Takashi. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As one example, claim 1 recites that the first and second scanning modules are independently translatable along their respective displacement paths. Hidetoshi teaches a scanner with two carriages 5a and 5b and states that both carriages are moved to simultaneously scan the object. Hidetoshi, however, never teaches or even suggests that both carriages independently move along their displacement paths.

As another example, claim 1 recites that the first and second modules are offset from each other along their respective displacement paths during a duplex mode to reduce bleed-through of light through the object. Neither Hidetoshi nor Takashi teach or even suggest offsetting the modules to reduce bleed-through of light through an object.

As one example, independent claim 39 recites that the first and second scanning modules are synchronously translated along their respective paths in a first mode and translated along their respective paths in a second mode such that positions of their respective paths are not same at any given time. Hidetoshi teaches a scanner with two carriages 5a and 5b and states that both carriages are moved to simultaneously scan the object. Hidetoshi, however, never teaches or even suggests that these carriages also move such that positions of their respective paths are not same at any given time. Takashi fails to cure these deficiencies.

As one example, independent claim 40 recites that the first and second modules are offset from each other along their respective displacement paths to reduce bleed-through of light through the object. Neither Hidetoshi nor Takashi teach or even suggest offsetting the modules to reduce bleed-through of light through an object.

As one example, independent claim 41 recites that one of said first and second scanning modules is farther along its displacement path than another of said first and second scanning modules such that a light source of the first scanning module is aligned with a photosensitive device of the second scanning module. Hidetoshi teaches a scanner having two carriages 5a and 5b. During a read operation, a CPU drives both carriages such that both sides of the object are simultaneously scanned. Hidetoshi never teaches or even suggests that one of the carriages is farther along its displacement path than the other carriage such that a light source of one carriage is aligned with a photosensitive device of the other carriage.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 4-17, and 37-41 are allowable over the art of record.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 10-13, 15-23, 27-28, 30-34, 39, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 07-254972 (Takashi). These rejections are traversed.

The claims recite one or more elements not taught in Takashi. Some examples are provided below for the independent claims.

As one example, independent claim 18 recites illuminating a first portion of an object with a first scanning module and a second portion of an object with a second scanning module. The claim also recites capturing light passing through said first portion by a second scanning module, and capturing light passing through said second portion by the first scanning module. Takashi does not teach capturing passed light at both the first and second modules. Takashi teaches a scanner that reads a document with either transparent or reflected processing of light. The light transmitted from the first or second

scanner 3 or 4 is either transmitted through the object or reflected by the object. Notice that Takashi expressly teaches light is transmitted from the first or second scanner, but not both scanners.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)). For at least these reasons, independent claim 18 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Takashi.

As one example, independent claim 29 recites that the first and second scanning modules are synchronously translated along their respective rails in a first mode of operation and translated in a second mode of operation such that positions of their respective rails are not same at any given time. Takashi is completely silent on translating the two modules in both of these modes.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)). For at least these reasons, independent claim 29 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Takashi.

As one example, independent claim 33 recites that the first scanning module moves along a displacement path to illuminate the first side of the object and capture light transmitted through the object from a second scanning module, and the second scanning module moves along a displacement path to illuminate the second side of said object and capture light transmitted through the object from the first scanning module. Takashi does not teach capturing passed light at both the first and second modules. Takashi teaches a scanner that reads a document with either transparent or reflected processing of light. The light transmitted from the first or second scanner 3 or 4 is either transmitted through the object or reflected by the object. Notice that Takashi expressly teaches light is transmitted from the first or second scanner, but not both scanners.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)). For at least these reasons, independent claim 33 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Takashi.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529